

When Science and Magic Combine: The Shameless Fraud known as Darwinian Evolution

by Jeremy James

“The earth is the LORD’s and the fulness thereof.” – Psalm 24:1



Like most college students in our modern, materialistic world, I was taught to believe in the so-called science of evolution. All the usual proofs were trotted out and we were expected to accept that the staggering diversity of life that we see around us was simply the product of a long series of random genetic mutations. This seemed a rather naive way of explaining phenomena which, even to my limited understanding, seemed incredibly complex.

Given sufficient time, could an elephant *really* evolve from a primitive micro-organism through multiple stages of ever-increasing complexity? The leap from one level to another seemed far too great for such an explanation to be tenable. But the experts alleged – and science claimed to prove – that any life-form could develop from a more primitive antecedent provided the right sequence of purely random changes at a chemical level had sufficient time to occur.

After graduation I continued to give thought to this question. It puzzled me that many so-called experts in the field, such as Dawkins and Gould, could make such far-reaching claims about the origin and design of the living world using the most nebulous forms of evidence. Their presumed proofs of evolution were interwoven with so many cozy assumptions and unproven connections that at times it was difficult to tell which elements of their argument were hard science and which were pure conjecture. They continually shied away from the hard test of reality, rather like an architect who feels entitled to ignore the law of gravity when designing an ambitious structure. Despite their bluster, they never seemed quite able to convince themselves – let alone their readers – that evolution was true, that an extremely long series of purely random events at a microscopic level could really produce ever-higher degrees of self-sustaining, self-replicating complexity.

A Massive Logical Hole

There was one problem in particular that bothered me, a problem which none of the experts seemed willing to address, or even acknowledge:

If millions of chance mutations are needed before one truly beneficial mutation can emerge, then what becomes of those mutations that are not immediately fatal to the organism and are passed on to the next generation? Such deleterious mutations would, from a statistical standpoint, far exceed the number of supposedly beneficial ones. Thus their inevitable entry into the gene pool would result in the progressive *deterioration* of a species and its eventual demise.

If Dawkins, Gould and the others were right, then the very mechanism that they were using to *explain* evolution must lead inexorably, not to the creation of a new species, but to the *destruction* of existing ones!

Even if this were the *only* logical problem with this so-called science, it would destroy it completely. But there are many others. In fact, the theory of evolution contravenes so many well-established principles of physics, chemistry and mathematics that it is difficult to understand why so many otherwise rational men and women continue to believe in it.

This paper tells the story behind the story, the true nature and purpose of the elaborate pseudo-science known as Evolution.

The Rat's Nest

The theory of evolution would be easy to defend if it were truly scientific, but because it is fundamentally irrational it must be reinforced, reinterpreted and reinvented almost continually. In addition, all kinds of distractions are employed by its most radical adherents in order to deflect attention from a rat's nest of embarrassing facts.

Here are just a few of these facts:

1. Salt-polluted oceans

The evolutionary process needs millions of years to operate successfully. However, even if the earth were just 10 million years old – a small fraction of the time required for ‘evolution’ to take effect – the oceans of the world would be so heavily laden with salt and other soluble mineral deposits that they would be as lifeless as the Dead Sea.

2. Total erosion

By the same token, at existing rates of weathering and erosion, the great mountain ranges of the world would have completely worn away and the earth’s surface would now be a soil-depleted wasteland. Furthermore, the accumulation of alluvium from the world’s rivers over such a long period would have covered the ocean floors with a uniform carpet of silt several miles deep. Since obviously neither is the case, we know that the earth must be thousands, not millions, of years old.

3. The radical gap between life and non-life

It has never been demonstrated that life of any kind can emerge from inanimate chemical constituents. Scientists have not even developed a theoretical model of how this might be achieved. In the so-called Miller-Urey experiment of 1953 a number of amino acids were synthesized from a mixture of water, methane, ammonia and hydrogen using high-voltage discharges. This rudimentary chemical reaction did not produce life of any kind, so the argument that it ‘came close’ or that a life-forming mechanism had been identified was pure humbug.

4. The deliberate trivialisation of complexity

Life cannot develop except in the form of a living cell, the smallest possible self-sustaining, self-reproducing organic unit. The early evolutionists, including Darwin himself, regarded the cell as a fairly simple structure, rather like a tiny protoplasmic clockwork device. This allowed them to employ a concept of ‘life’ that could be explained in fairly primitive mechanical terms. Of course, an evolutionary explanation is much easier to sustain if the fundamental components of life are defined in a trivial way.

Scientific advances over the past 100 years or so have confirmed that the cell is many millions of times more complex than the simple mechanism that Darwin and his contemporaries had imagined. Even the most primitive cell is now known to contain dozens of types of organelles which move around in a highly structured manner performing an amazing array of intricate functions.

The cell is in reality an immensely complex chemical factory, with hundreds of discrete processes taking place at the same time. Among its many highly sophisticated components are DNA, RNA, cytoplasm, ribosomes, enzymes, mitochondria, proteins, locomotive cilia, and an elaborate system of cytoplasmic membranes, sacs and vesicles.

In addition, the mitochondria are known to possess their *own* DNA and RNA, which is completely different from the DNA and RNA found elsewhere in the cell. And since they are self-replicating, they are produced only by an earlier generation of mitochondria – the cell nucleus itself cannot produce them. Thus, in order to function properly, a cell must contain an energy-producing organelle which cannot survive outside the cell and which the cell itself cannot produce!

To believe that something this complex could have arisen by chance is disingenuous in the extreme. Statistically it could never happen, no matter how much time was allowed to elapse.

We will discuss the question of probability in more detail below.

5. The complete absence of intermediary forms in the fossil record

For a new species to evolve gradually over a long period of time, it would have to pass through a number of intermediary stages before a fully functioning, survival-enhancing attribute could be added to its genetic code. Dozens of transitional body forms would conceivably be required before this new state was attained. These in turn should appear with great frequency in the fossil record. Evolutionists in the 19th century, who lacked fossil evidence of this kind, were confident that such intermediary forms would soon be identified, but this never happened. All species – whether they are fish, crustaceans, reptiles, mammals, marsupials, insects, or birds – appear suddenly in the fossil record, fully formed, without any intermediary stages whatsoever.

In a proper scientific discipline an anomaly of this magnitude would quickly consign a theory to the trash heap, but in the strange world of evolution – where principles like causality, proof and evidence are applied only when they support the outcome one is seeking – such an obvious outcome is not even considered.

6. Recourse to circular reasoning

Some of the key concepts in evolutionary theory are actually based on circular reasoning. For example, evolution is meant to guarantee the survival of the fittest, but the fittest are never defined in any meaningful way. They are simply the individuals who survive! This kind of reasoning is depressingly silly, but it is quite common among the Darwinian elite who dominate the biological sciences today.

We have already seen how a cell cannot function without the mitochondria that supply it with essential energy, but its own DNA cannot produce the necessary mitochondria. No cell, no mitochondria; no mitochondria, no cell. Such interdependant relationships cannot be explained in evolutionary terms – unless one resorts to some form of circular reasoning.

Let's take another example. The age of a fossil is determined by the rock stratum in which it is found, but these strata in turn are assigned a position in the geological column by reference to the fossils they contain.

If you are not already familiar with the strange world of evolution, you may think I am making this stuff up, but incredibly I am not.

7. Conflict with other branches of science

All branches of science – with one exception – recognise and accept the second law of thermodynamics. This law states that all orderly processes in the universe are continually moving into a less ordered state. In short they are decaying. The most obvious example is progressive heat loss. Every object, large or small, terrestrial or interstellar, is losing heat through radiation. This can never be recaptured in its totality, which means that every ordered system will eventually lose heat and die unless more is added from another source.

This law commands respect in every branch of science except evolutionary biology. Why? Because it refutes a fundamental tenet of evolution, namely, that an ordered system can advance, purely by chance, into a more ordered state. In short, the second law of thermodynamics, sometimes known as the law of entropy, guarantees that nothing can ever evolve. Therefore, unless several other branches of science are seriously defective, the so-called science of evolution is completely bogus.

8. Uniformitarianism

Since evolution needs hundreds of millions of years to take effect, the fossil record must reflect this. The sedimentary rock strata in which fossils are embedded must therefore have accumulated in an extremely slow, uniform manner across all regions of the earth's crust. If changes in rock strata took place over a short period of time, then any fossils they contain must have 'evolved' over an equally short period of time, which would conflict with the theory of evolution.

For this reason the sister science of geology has postulated that all transformative processes on the earth's surface for eons past have been very slow and very gradual, much like those we see today. This completely excludes the possibility of a catastrophic event which may have radically altered the profile and composition of rock strata across large parts of the earth's crust.

This assumption – for it is nothing more – is known as uniformitarianism. Even though there are countless geological phenomena that cannot be explained satisfactorily in accordance with a uniformitarian mechanism, it continues to dominate the science of geology. These include the formation of the Grand Canyon in Colorado, the existence of truly massive boulders in locations far removed from their place of origin, and the radical misalignment of rock strata which supposedly accumulated along uniformitarian lines on a continental scale over millions of years.

Uniformitarianism is such an orthodox dogma of geology that it has remained virtually immune to criticism for nearly two hundred years. Despite extensive evidence that the earth's crust has been subjected to significant upheaval in the recent past, the possibility is simply dismissed.

9. The geological column

Uniformitarian principles require that rock strata develop slowly over long periods of time, with layers of distinct morphology and composition accumulating one on top of another. The logic of this model requires that the sequence be consistent on a continental scale since otherwise no meaningful conclusions could be drawn about the time epoch in which they were laid down. All layers of the same type should therefore denote the same segment of geological time. Geologists have analysed these layers in a wide variety of locations around the globe and compiled what is known as the 'geological column', a kind of universal timepiece for determining the age of each layer.

We have already noted a major problem with the geological column, namely that the age of each layer was initially calculated by reference to the fossils that it contained, while the age of the fossils was determined largely by reference to the layer in which it was found. But there is another remarkable problem with the geological column – it doesn't actually exist! Not one extant example of the column may be found anywhere on earth. Furthermore, in many places where segments of the alleged column do exist, the sequence of layers differs from the one 'approved' by the scientific community. Given that each layer was meant to have accumulated along uniformitarian lines over millions of years, it is difficult to explain how even one layer could appear out of sequence.

10. Fossilisation

There is no doubt that an astonishing variety of species, many of which are now extinct, may be found in the fossil record. Their authenticity is not disputed. But a truly unusual fact is often overlooked, namely that uniformitarian model has no way explaining how they got there!

The natural world has an abundance of species which live off carrion, which scavenge for dead and dying animals, and which leave no respectable remnant to be fossilised. Even those few fragments that escape the scavengers are shortly thereafter consumed by insects, bacteria and a multiplicity of micro-organisms. According to the evolutionary theorists we are expected to believe, not just that intact carcasses can remain untouched for many weeks or months, but that they can retain their integrity for such long periods that soil and other debris have sufficient time to accumulate and entomb them. Even scientists who explore the ocean floor in regions rich in marine life are unable to find even a vestige of the material that would be needed to form a fossilised carcass or skeleton.

In short, organic matter cannot survive long enough, either in the soil or in the sea, to be amenable to the ultra-slow process of fossilisation – yet another glaring flaw with the uniformitarian model and the theory of evolution.

11. Fossil abundance

If the earth is as old as the evolutionists maintain, and fossilisation proceeds in accordance with the uniformitarian model, then one ought to find an abundance of fossils in all sedimentary rocks – without exception. A hundred million years is a truly enormous period of time, during which virtually every square mile of the earth's surface should have accumulated hundreds, if not thousands of tons of fossilised material. But fossil troves are relatively rare and the widespread distribution that one would expect is simply not found.

12. Fossil graveyards

Evolutionists play down an intriguing (and anomalous) aspect of fossil deposition, namely the frequency with which they are found in 'fossil graveyards', large aggregations of the fossilised remains of a wide variety of species. Many of these 'graveyards' – also known as *bone beds* or *lagerstätten* – contain a bewildering diversity of animals. For example, the Maotianshan Shales in Yunnan Province, China, has 185 different species among its fossilised fauna, comprising an amazing 15 phylums. It's as though several sections of a large zoo had been frozen in time. The rate of fossilization was so rapid that even the antennae and other soft body parts of the trilobites were preserved.

A process of slow fossilization could not have achieved either of these outcomes. Soft body parts would have decayed long before detail of this quality could have been preserved, while the statistical probability that so many different species should come together seriatim in this one location over thousands, if not millions, of years and just happen to get fossilized, is a resounding nil.

The phenomena observed at Maotianshan could only have resulted from a short traumatic event which killed all of the specimens at the same time, perhaps even the same day, and embalmed them in mud. Furthermore, the diversity of the species found in the shales would suggest that many of them had originated across a wide geographical area and were transported to the 'graveyard' in a massive flood of some kind. In short, fossil graveyards offer no evidence of evolution and make a laughingstock of the uniformitarian model.

13. Human population

According to the evolutionists, mankind evolved in the Great Rift Valley in north-east Africa about 200,000 years ago. Now let's consider for a moment the severe practical implications of this. If we assume that the rate of population increase among early man was broadly similar to the rate obtaining today – a little over 1 percent – and if we assume that the total human population of the earth 200,000 years ago was a mere 100 individuals, then it would have grown to several trillion (not billion) in less than *ten* thousand years!

Perhaps a global annual rate of increase of 1 percent is too high. However, even if we use a lesser rate, we still get an astronomical expansion in the population in just a few thousand years. For example, some historians reckon that the population of the planet as a whole at the time of Christ was around 100 million. Based on a current (2012) world population of 7 billion, this represents a long-run annual increase of slightly over one fifth of one percent (0.212%). If we apply the same annual rate of increase to our Rift Valley population, it would have grown from 100 individuals to 157 billion in just 10,000 years. After a few more millennia, there would have been no space on the planet for even one more person.

As you can see, the Great Rift Valley theory is sheer nonsense. It should not even be dignified with the epithet 'theory'.

If we extrapolate backwards from today's population using only a *slightly* higher (but still very conservative) annual growth rate – 0.302% instead of 0.212% – we find that a starting population of 100 people would have increased to seven billion, the current population of the world, in about 6,000 years. This is fully consistent with the timeframe found in the Bible.

14. Simultaneous evolution of sexual opposites

Evolutionists regularly rhapsodize over the ingenious way 'nature' has achieved optimum genetic diversity through cross-pollination and sexual reproduction. But they give little attention to the serious problem that this poses for evolutionary theory. The actual transmission of genetic material from the male to the female is a remarkably complex process, both chemically and behaviourally, in a vast number of species.

For example, in many species the male must emit certain chemical triggers to which the female must respond in a very specific way. Unless his signal and her response are exactly right, they will not mate. But, according to the theory of evolution, the reproductive mechanisms in both the male and the female must have evolved independently. Therefore evolutionists actually believe that the genes which enable these two highly complex, complementary processes to operate just happened to evolve in exactly the right way at exactly the same time in exactly the same location. Of course, this is utterly impossible – a complete fantasy. But it is fairly typical of the evolutionary mindset, where an astronomical series of improbably accidents is deemed to occur, not once but twice, and produce two perfectly adapted, sexually compatible organisms of dazzling complexity.

It's as though eons of time were a kind of pixie dust that can bring order out of chaos.

15. Mutation of Fruit-Flies

Evolutionists insist that a series of random mutations must eventually give rise to one which somehow confers an actual or potential advantage on a species, however small the change may be. In their determination to provide experimental evidence of this, they have bred countless generations of fruit-flies (*drosophila melanogaster*) under controlled laboratory conditions and induced random mutations in their genetic code through irradiation and other methods.

Since the fruit fly can produce a new generation every two weeks or so, scientists have been able to observe the outcome across hundreds of generations. So how many new species have been produced by this process? How many new proteins? How many new enzymes?

The answer: Not one.

We could cite many more jaw-dropping anomalies in evolutionary theory, but these ought to be sufficient. The list is long and getting longer as more and more scientists are beginning to regain their sanity and asking fairly obvious questions about this absurd pseudo-science.

Many scientists who reject evolutionary theory have a background in mathematics, informatics, chemistry or engineering, where convenient assumptions are anathema, where experimental rigour is essential, and where woolly reasoning is ruthlessly exposed. They also understand such basics as the laws of probability, the second law of thermodynamics, and the destructive effect of chance events on organised systems. They also tend on the whole to be more intelligent – one doesn't need to be all that smart to collect rocks and insects for a living.

We will shortly discuss the reasons why more scientists do not openly condemn the pseudo-science of evolution, but first we need to look why so many still accept it.

Why do so many scientists continue to believe in evolution?

It should be apparent by now that one must be willing to make a great many assumptions in order to believe in evolution. A well-developed ability to ignore unpalatable facts is also a great advantage. Having said that, most of those who accept evolution are sincere and well-meaning in their convictions. They have been taught the 'science' at mainstream academic institutions and have no reason to doubt the integrity of their professors. Should some aspects of evolutionary theory appear less than convincing, diligent students are expected to find solace in the knowledge that such a powerful explanatory paradigm must of necessity have elements that are difficult to understand. Besides, if everyone else believes it to be fundamentally true, then it must be okay. After all, the only real alternative is to believe that God created everything – which, in an age of rampant scepticism, is a step too far.

Evolutionists have used a wide range of tricks down the years to deceive and beguile the unwary. We have already discussed one of them – the *Simple Cell* trick – which trivialises complexity and conceals the very phenomena that evolution is supposed to explain. Another is the *Endless Time* trick which, when all else fails, allows *any* problem to be solved, no matter how intractable, by simply immersing it for millions of years in the mystical pool of pure chance.

The following table lists some of the most common swindles employed by evolutionists to circumvent the laws of logic:

Eight tricks frequently used by evolutionists to deceive both themselves and the public		
	Title	Short Description
1.	<i>The Simple Cell Trick</i>	Dramatically understates the incredible complexity of the living cell.
2.	<i>The Big Number Trick</i>	Disguises or ignores the reality of statistical impossibilities.
3.	<i>The Order-out-of-Chaos Trick</i>	Ignores the Second Law of Thermodynamics which states that order can never increase by chance.
4.	<i>The Pig's Tooth Trick</i>	Draws major inferences from trivial data and assumes non-existent connections.
5.	<i>The Similarity Trick</i>	Assumes that things which look the same really are the same, whether structurally or functionally.
6.	<i>The Endless Time Trick</i>	Assumes that, given enough time, virtually anything can happen.
7.	<i>The Circular Reasoning Trick</i>	Uses A to prove B and B to prove A.
8.	<i>The Rat's Nest Trick</i>	Ignores uncomfortable facts and contradictory evidence.

One of the most popular Darwinian parlour games is the *Big Number* trick which exploits the common inability, even among experienced scientists, to comprehend the magnitude of really large numbers.

We can all form a mental picture of a collection of ten thousand objects, for example the total number of seats in a football stadium. This figure (10,000) can be expressed another way, as 10 to the power of 4 (which may be denoted as 10^4). This is 10 multiplied by itself 4 times [$10 \times 10 \times 10 \times 10 = 10,000$]. But we run into difficulty when we try to come up with similar mental pictures for much larger numbers. For example, how would you envisage 10^{100} grains of sand? As a long beach, perhaps, or a huge quarry? An astute individual might opt for an object as large as the earth. But even he would be way off the mark. Physicists have calculated that the total matter in the universe – over 80 billion galaxies – contains approximately 10^{80} atoms. This means that not even the universe itself could contain our pile of sand!

We call these tricks rather than fallacies because they have been exploited shamelessly for decades by atheistic materialists to deceive their victims.

Is *deceive* too strong a word? Well, if a set of known logical fallacies are continuously exploited in a systematic way to achieve a particular outcome, then we are talking about deception. Not bad science, not ideological bias, but deception.

T H Huxley, who was probably the most ardent public advocate of Darwin's theory in the period following the publication of *The Origin of Species* (1859), had no qualms about exploiting both the *Simple Cell* trick and the *Big Number* trick. During some of his famous public debates he claimed that, given enough time, a team of 100 monkeys typing on a 100 typewriters, day and night, without stopping, would eventually type out Psalm 23. To most of his audience this seemed a fairly plausible proposition. After all, if the monkeys just keep hammering away they are bound to get there eventually – aren't they?

Let's take a closer look. The whole question is one of probability. Just how long would they have to keep typing to produce the intended outcome? Psalm 23 (in the King James Version) contains 461 characters (For the sake of simplicity we'll ignore spaces and capitalisation. We'll also be kind to the monkeys and give them typewriters with just 26 keys).

Psalm 23

The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the LORD for ever.

The probability that the first monkey would strike the letter 't' on his first stroke is 1 in 26. The probability that he would strike the letter 'h' on his second stroke is also 1 in 26. The same probability applies to each of the 461 letters in the psalm. However, the probability that he would do this for 461 successive strokes in the required sequence is **not** 26 x 461 **but** 26 to the power of 461 (26⁴⁶¹).

The members of Huxley's audience had absolutely no idea that they were dealing with numbers of this magnitude. The truth is that 26^{461} is so incredibly large that an event contingent upon such a probability could never arise. The monkeys would **never** succeed in typing the psalm correctly, no matter how long they spent at their typewriters. In fact, they wouldn't even manage to type the first two sentences correctly!

Statisticians usually take 10^{40} as the point beyond which an event is impossible. In other words, if that is the number of random iterations that are needed to achieve the outcome in question, then it simply cannot happen – ever. Please take careful note of this crucial fact. It is science, hard mathematics, and not the childish make-believe that passes for science in the field of evolutionary biology.

Countless scientists in our modern industrial and academic communities – men and woman of learning and intelligence – have been taken for fools. They too have fallen for the *Simple Cell* trick and the *Big Number* trick. Perhaps the tricks are being packaged in a more sophisticated manner than they were in the days of Huxley and his crew, but they are still fundamentally the same tricks.

The college textbooks also take care to omit the Rat's Nest of anomalies that we noted earlier. Their presence would only prompt the more perceptive students to start thinking for themselves. If they did they would soon come to realize that the so-called science of evolution is built, not on tangible evidence, consistent logic and causal progression, but wishful thinking, pixie dust, and a cult-like avoidance of unpleasant facts.

The psychology of mass deception

The psychology behind all of this has been known for centuries. If a sufficient number of people can be induced to believe that something is true, especially if it is presented as such by someone in authority and supported by seemingly legitimate scientific evidence, it can be very difficult thereafter to shake their belief. The story of Sam Loyd and the Fifteen Tile puzzle is a graphic demonstration of this.

Sam Loyd was both a skilled mathematician and a pioneer in the field of puzzle composition in the 19th century. For many years he ran a popular column in a leading American newspaper. Some of his puzzles were so challenging that he often received hundreds of letters a day from his readers. He once published a tile-sliding puzzle, known as the Fifteen Tile puzzle which, he said, “drove the entire world crazy”:



The goal was very simple, namely, by sliding the tiles back and forth, to rearrange them in numerical sequence 1-15. This meant reversing the positions of tiles '14' and '15' in the initial position. As an added inducement, Loyd offered \$1000 – a truly magnificent prize in those days – to the person who submitted the first correct solution. Naturally, since the prize was so generous and the puzzle so easy to understand, the competition excited enormous public interest and the response was overwhelming.

Thousands of his readers were convinced that they had cracked the problem. Doubtless, many of the proposed solutions were ingenious and flattered both the intelligence and diligence of their authors. But Loyd didn't need to open and examine a single entry. Why? Because the puzzle has no solution.

The Fifteen Tile puzzle is known to mathematicians to be solvable in only half of all starting positions. All the rest are impossible. Loyd simply chose one of the impossible positions, where the tiles were teasingly close to the correct sequence, and invited his readers to torture themselves to the point of madness trying to solve it.

Perhaps it was not entirely fair of Loyd to set a puzzle that couldn't be solved, but his readers didn't suspect a thing. After all, the problem was easy to understand, the prize was immensely attractive, and Loyd enjoyed a sterling reputation.

Contemporary scientists continue to believe in the Theory of Evolution for very similar reasons: It has been put together and promoted by people of high reputation; it is not too hard to understand; and the prize – a comprehensive explanation of life itself – is immensely attractive. The only drawback, of course, is that – like Loyd's puzzle – it is nothing more than a slick piece of chicanery.

The Real Agenda behind the Theory of Evolution

In light of all this we must ask why a theory that contravenes so many principles of mathematics and sound reason could have been propounded in the first place? If it was not designed to satisfy our appetite for scientific integrity, then what *was* it designed for?

The answer is human pride, the age-old desire of rebellious, fallen men to assert their independence from God.

Evolution is not a science but a religious conviction, a determined effort to account for life on earth without reference to a Creator. Many of its pioneers despised Christianity. The vast majority of its original proponents were atheists, humanists or freemasons. While pretending to be scientists engaged in the impartial and objective pursuit of truth, they rejected from the outset an explanation that reflected a Biblical perspective.

This is the mindset that dominates the scientific establishment today. All observable phenomena **must** be interpreted and explained without any reference whatsoever to a Creator.

Please think carefully about this, dear reader, since it is crucial to understanding what is really happening in our world today. Science, as constituted by the people who control our colleges and universities, must **always** exclude God. This is the core principle and defining characteristic of contemporary science. It was first established by the Royal Society in England in 1660, most of whose members were either Rosicrucians or Freemasons, and by the French Academy of Sciences, which was dominated by Grand Orient Freemasonry, an intensely anti-Christian brand of paganism.

Of course, many scientists *do* believe in a Creator, but they are not allowed to express this dynamic in their professional lives. A well-argued paper by a reputable scientist which tried to show – or even suggest – that God is at work in the universe would be dismissed as ‘religious’ and rejected by the editor. It would never see the light of day.

A remarkable example of this pernicious mindset may be found in a review by Richard Lewontin in *The New York Times Book Reviews*, 9 January 1997. Professor Lewontin, who has held several prestigious academic posts during his illustrious career, is a staunch advocate of evolution and highly regarded by his peers. The opinion that he expressed in his review is endemic today among evolutionary biologists, most of whom gloat over the dismissal of God from all scientific discourse [*Note: The italicised words were in the original*]:

Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science *in spite* of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite* of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite* of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. The eminent Kant scholar Lewis Beck used to say that anyone who could believe in God could believe in anything. To appeal to an omnipotent deity is to allow that at any moment the regularities of nature may be ruptured, that miracles may happen.

We are grateful to Professor Lewontin for revealing, perhaps unwittingly, the true motivation behind the evolutionary agenda. He states plainly that he and his atheistic colleagues hold to absurd constructs because of their prior commitment to materialism. It really doesn't matter to them how ridiculous a scientific proposition may be as long as it excludes God, “for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.” As he boasts, “materialism is absolute.”

And that, dear reader, is what it's all about.

The Long War Against God

Evolution is a profoundly political issue. The Freemasonic elite and ultra-rich atheists who control the pulse of academia in Britain, Germany, France, Italy and the United States – and have done so for centuries – will not tolerate any attempt to connect creation with its Creator. Since they loath the God of the Bible, they must find an alternative way to account for the existence of life on earth, and even of the earth itself. Some scientists have tried to go down the pan-spermia road, whereby life on earth is explained by the chance arrival in our atmosphere of frozen bacteria from the depths of space, carried vast distances on interstellar dust. Others have speculated that, eons ago, life on earth was ‘seeded’ deliberately by intelligent lifeforms from another galaxy. But, to date, neither of these ‘explanations’ has won favour with the majority of scientists, probably because they speculate only about the distribution of life and not its origin.

Thus evolution is the only game in town. It carries with it the further advantage of promoting an evolutionary paradigm in other branches of science, notably cosmology. If the masses can be trained to accept that life on earth evolved from inert matter, then it should be relatively easy to convince them that the universe itself evolved out of nothing. [This is the so-called ‘Big Bang’ theory, another outrageous piece of pseudo-science which, alas, we have no time to address in this short paper.]

Must one be an atheist or an enemy of God to believe in evolution? Not at all! I suspect that most scientists who believe in evolution do so simply because they have been trained to believe it. The modern educational system has been framed in the main by humanists and atheists who hate Christianity and wish to destroy it. As a result it has greatly blunted our inborn ability to ask an honest question and not be satisfied until we get an honest answer.

Evolution is a consensus view which cannot tolerate criticism of any kind. To question evolution is to question science itself. An academic who does so risks being drummed out of his faculty or ostracized as a crank. Numerous academics in good standing have been punished for expressing doubts about the scientific validity of evolution. Many were non-Christian and didn’t even work in a life-science faculty. Punishment can include peer ridicule, exclusion from seminars and conferences, loss of promotion, inability to get papers published, failure to secure research funding, and even loss of tenure.

Over the last fifty years or so, Creation scientists and proponents of a creationist position have published devastating critiques of evolutionary theory. There was a time when evolutionists were prepared to stand on a public platform and debate the scientific validity of evolution with their Creationist opponents. However, they were annihilated with such frequency that they are no longer willing to expose themselves to ridicule in this way. Even Richard Dawkins, a radical advocate of evolution, is very careful to avoid public debate with seasoned Creationists. The only ‘debate’ evolutionists will conduct is through the controlled media and publishing houses, where all of the embarrassing questions can be pushed to one side and where a sickly caricature of the Creationist position can be ridiculed with impunity.

Why do leading newspapers never publish an article addressing the many known flaws and defects in evolutionary theory? Because they don't want the public to know just how irrational and dishonest it really is. The Masonic cabal who control *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Post*, *The London Times*, *Berliner Zeitung*, and *Le Monde*, along with dozens of other influential newspapers in both Europe and America, have no intention of providing a platform for views which might expose the great lie of evolution and the covert propaganda machine that underpins it.

The False God of Freemasonry

To understand the forces behind the strange science of evolution, one needs to realise that, while Freemasonry pretends to be 'Christian' or at least sympathetic to the ideals and traditions of Christianity, it is in fact an ancient religious system which despises Christianity. Its gods are those of Egypt and Babylon, Greece and Rome – the pagan pantheons that embody the energies and personalities of the fallen angels.

Freemasonry strives by every means possible to focus man's attention on himself. It is a humanistic, Luciferian doctrine which denies Christ, the need for salvation, and the truths of the Bible. It works in secret because it would never dare approach the light and reveal its true nature.

Freemasons call their god the *Great Architect*. Why? Because he can devise plans and schemes and strategies of great sophistication. On the other hand his high-sounding name reveals a much less flattering fact about him, namely that he can create **nothing**. Absolutely nothing.

This is why Freemasonry is so keen to promote 'evolution' as a creative force. How did the universe come into being? The answer: It evolved out of nothing. And where did the amazing panorama of life come from? The answer: It evolved out of inanimate matter, which in turn evolved out of nothing. QED.

This allows them to reject utterly any need for a Creator and elevates their own god – the so-called Great Architect – to the apex of the Cosmic Pantheon. It even allows them to believe that man himself will continue to evolve and one day become a god.

[I am reminded here of the only Aramaic verse in the Book of Jeremiah, a verse that could readily be understood by any Gentile Baal worshipper of his day: "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens." (Jeremiah 10:11) In short, when Christ returns, these inflated 'gods' will be destroyed.]

Denial of a Cataclysmic Global Flood

Satan uses his 'angel of light' persona, known as Lucifer, to beguile his principal agents. These in turn create systems of worship on his behalf – such as Freemasonry – to ensnare and control the masses. It matters little to him what men believe as long as they don't believe in the LORD God of Creation and his only Son, Christ Jesus.

Evolution is an antichrist philosophy. Its principal purpose is to shake man's belief in the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis. Since one of the most dramatic events in Genesis was the global cataclysm known as the Flood (or Deluge), it became necessary to suppress all evidence that an event of such destructiveness had actually occurred some 4400 years ago. This would have several advantages. Firstly, it would consolidate the uniformitarian interpretation of geophysical phenomena. Secondly, it would hide from mankind the awesome magnitude of the LORD's judgment on a sinful world. And thirdly, it would serve to discredit the historical accuracy of Genesis and the veracity of the Bible as a whole.

As we have already noted, the foundations for evolutionary theory were laid in the early part of the 19th century with the uniformitarian doctrine of modern geology. This asserts that the only natural processes at work in the past were the same ones that we see operating in the world today. It was designed to reduce the Deluge to a small scale, regional event or, better still, to dismiss it entirely as a dramatic piece of fiction. Instead it proposed that the complex topology of the planet was formed in a very mundane manner by tiny changes over millions of years. Even though there was little original evidence to support this theory, it soon became widely accepted across Britain where it was first promulgated. And this happened only because many leading figures in the Anglican church were prepared to regard it as legitimate science.

It may seem difficult at first to understand why the majority of Anglican bishops and clergy should have responded so tamely to what was obviously a deliberate attack on the veracity of the Bible. However, when one realizes that a significant proportion of these men were actually non-believers and, in many cases, members of their local Masonic lodge, it begins to make sense. They had entered into a career with the Established Church – the official 'Christian' denomination of the British ruling class – because it promised security, a good income, high social standing, and a fairly undemanding lifestyle. An Anglican clergyman of the early 19th century was often as worldly, ambitious and indifferent to truth as many brokers and financiers are today.

With the craven capitulation of the Anglican Church, it was relatively easy to infect the minds and hearts of millions of people across Britain with this false teaching and, through the long reach of Empire, the world at large.

It is fashionable today to blame atheists and the like for the corruption of Christianity, but this is not really the case. They have a role, of course, but the chief blame lies with the preachers and pastors who no longer believe the Word of God. Had the Anglican clergy in the 19th century comprised a goodly body of true believers – instead of soft-living, séance-attending sceptics and Freemasons – she could have neutralised the false teaching of the Luciferian elite without too much difficulty.

Exactly the same phenomenon was at work in America in the 20th century, where the greatest enemies of the Word of God were – and still are – the thousands of Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Pentecostal and Evangelical ministers who have consistently refused to take a stand against the dark forces of abortion, divorce, adultery, pornography, sexual perversion, pseudo-science, Freemasonry, New Age and occult teachings, and double-standards of every kind. A great many are themselves Freemasons (closet Luciferians), and are even more worldly in their conduct and outlook than their misguided parishioners.

Evolution as a justification for Racism and Eugenics

Evolution is a false, irrational philosophy which poses a very grave threat to the well-being of society. By describing human life as just one of many accidents in a long series of biological accidents, it cheapens humanity to an unimaginable degree. Murder has no meaning if human life has no meaning, except in zoological terms. Thus the killing of a child in the womb can be justified on the grounds that he or she is merely an undeveloped part of the mother's body. The modern abortion industry thrives on this horrific lie.

This fraudulent science has also played a major role in promoting the modern philosophy of eugenics. While eugenic ideas had long been visible in various strands of British empiricist philosophy, their application took a big step forward with the First International Eugenics Congress in London in 1912, which was led by Leonard Darwin, son of the racist, Charles Darwin. This was matched by similar developments in other countries, notably America and Germany.

Eugenics is based on the principle that human stock can be improved and that, as far as possible, inferior stock should not be allowed to breed. This belief permeates the mindset of the ultra-rich elite who currently exercise an iron grip on world affairs.

The Elite are convinced that, without strict regulation, the world's population will grow to the point where the very survival of humanity would be under threat. In their view it must be brought under control long before it reaches that point. To do this, they reason, a strict reproductive code must be enforced on a global scale. And if this is to be carried out effectively a system of world government must be introduced and the existing system of sovereign states abolished. The world should be ruled only by those who are born to rule.

The greater the delay in creating a socialist world government, the more extreme the solution will have to be. Inferior human stock is breeding exponentially and must be stopped. If covert sterilization through mass vaccination, atmospheric spraying and similar programs does not work, then more direct methods of mass culling will have to be introduced.

If this seems utterly improbable, think again. Remember, the Elite believe in evolution and survival of the fittest. In their twisted perception, the strong are not just morally entitled but morally *obliged* to eliminate the weak. It may seem callous, but it's a natural law. There are times when the strong must act decisively in their own best interests, when they must set aside sentimentality and do what must be done. If millions must die so that their own genetic excellence can survive and prosper, then so be it.

Some of the most respected intellectuals in British society in the last century were vocal proponents of this view. Consider, for example, the following remarks by H G Wells:

“And for the rest, those swarms of black, and brown, and dirty-white, and yellow people, who do not come into the new needs of efficiency ? Well, the world is a world, not a charitable institution, and I take it they will have to go. The whole tenor and meaning of the world, as I see it, is that they have to go. So far as they fail to develop sane, vigorous, and distinctive personalities for the great world of the future, it is their portion to die out and disappear.” (p.317)

- H G Wells, *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress Upon Human Life and Thought*, 1902

Note that this opinion was expressed in one of Wells' non-fiction works. The racism behind it is truly astonishing – no high profile figure today would dare openly to express such an opinion. But the Elite were less secretive about their intentions a hundred years ago.

Occasionally, however, one of their members reveals just a little too much. One of these was Sir Julian Huxley, the first Director-General of UNESCO:

At the moment, it is probable that the indirect effect of civilisation is dysgenic instead of eugenic; and in any case it seems likely that the dead weight of genetic stupidity, physical weakness, mental instability, and disease-proneness, which already exist in the human species, will prove too great a burden for real progress to be achieved. Thus even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable... (p.21)

Still another and quite different type of borderline subject is that of eugenics. It has been on the borderline between the scientific and the unscientific, constantly in danger of becoming a pseudoscience based on preconceived political ideas or on assumptions of racial or class superiority and inferiority. It is, however, essential that eugenics should be brought entirely within the borders of science, for as already indicated, in the not very remote future the problem of improving the average quality of human beings is likely to become urgent; and this can only be accomplished by applying the findings of a truly scientific eugenics. (p.37-38)

– Sir Julian Huxley, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*, 1948

Here we have a Globalist organization – UNESCO – promoting eugenics as a scientific solution to “the dead weight of genetic stupidity.” Note also that Huxley is not talking about improving living standards among humanity but of “improving the average quality of human beings.” In other words, he wants to use eugenics as an “urgent” means of improving the quality of human stock.

The Global Elite also intend to execute this program of population reduction with astonishing indifference to the suffering of their victims. Here is how Bertrand Russell, revered icon of the British intelligentsia, expressed their attitude:

I do not pretend that birth control is the only way in which population can be kept from increasing. There are others, which, one must suppose, opponents of birth control would prefer. War, as I remarked a moment ago, has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. There would be nothing in this to offend the consciences of the devout or to restrain the ambitions of nationalists. The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's. (p.103-104)

– Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society*, 1953

Obviously men like Wells, Huxley and Russell must have been guided in their thinking by an ideal standard of genetic purity and human excellence. In case you have not already guessed, that ideal was found among the British ruling class. This prejudice had already been given an academic veneer by Darwin in his two classic works, *On the Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*. The former was published in 1859 and carried a most revealing sub-title: *The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle to Survive*. Since they had long viewed themselves as one of these “favoured races” the British now had the scientific, and therefore the moral, justification they needed for the conquest and exploitation of people they deemed inferior.

Modern evolutionary biologists prefer to gloss over the deeply racist origins of their so-called science and the vital role it has played – and continues to play – in promoting eugenics and the extermination of people who are considered defective, inferior, or subnormal. The Nazis could never have slaughtered so many groups – Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, retarded children, and other ‘undesirables’ – without a seemingly scientific basis for doing so. Once the public is convinced that one race is more ‘human’ than another, more ‘evolved’ than another, or fundamentally ‘superior’ to another, it is a small step to argue that, for the good of humanity as a whole, the inferior race should be enslaved, culled or eliminated.

Few scientists today read the original works by Darwin, preferring instead to rely on modern re-statements of his ideas. But they ought to go back and see firsthand the depth of racism that informed them. The following give just a flavour of the racism underpinning *The Descent of Man*:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes...will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla. (p.178)

– Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, London, 1874 (second) edition; first published 1871

Like most leading British intellectuals of his day, Darwin believed that the white European would eventually “exterminate” the “savage races” of the world. As he saw it, the extermination of the negro would mean that man’s nearest relative would then be the lowly baboon.

If you have any doubts about the depth and intensity of the racism at work here, not to mention its genocidal potential, just consider the following:

If we look back to an extremely remote epoch, before man had arrived at the dignity of manhood, he would have been guided more by instinct and less by reason than are the lowest savages at the present time. (p.52)

With some savages, however, the foot has not altogether lost its prehensile power, as shown by their manner of climbing trees and of using them in other ways. (p.58)

Judging from the habits of savages and of the greater number of the Quadrumana [apes, monkeys, etc], primeval men, and even their ape-like progenitors, probably lived in society. (p.70)

With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. There is reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands, who from a weak constitution would formerly have succumbed to small-pox. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed. (p.151-152)

The western nations of Europe, who now so immeasurably surpass their former savage progenitors and stand at the summit of civilization... (p.160)

The sentiments expressed here by Darwin could hardly be plainer. Allowing these “savage” races to multiply is “highly injurious to the race of man.” Only an irresponsible livestock manager would allow the “worst animals to breed.” The implication is clear – the “immeasurably” superior Anglo-Saxon must take the necessary steps to ensure that this dreadful state of affairs is not allowed to continue.

The Descent of Man is peppered throughout with statements which portray negroes and the so-called “savage” races as degenerate, having more in common with animals than with Anglo-Saxon man. Here is how he describes one species of monkey:

With some monkeys the beard is confined to the male, as in the orang; or is much larger in the male than in the female, as in the *Mycetes caraya* and *Pithecia satanas* (fig.68).




Fig. 68. *Pithecia satanas*, male

...The resemblance to a negro in miniature of *Pithecia satanas* with his jet-black skin, white rolling eyeballs and hair parted on the top of the head is almost ludicrous. (p.607 and p.690)

I regret having to include this tasteless piece of Darwinian propaganda, but it perfectly illustrates the deep vein of racism which permeates the Elitist mindset. What is more, it shows that this racism is very deeply rooted and is bound to result in outcomes that are injurious or fatal to other ethnic groups.

These depraved ideas have long held sway in British Establishment circles, and have been taught – usually covertly – in leading universities like Oxford, Cambridge and the London School of Economics. They were also transmitted to the most influential centers of learning in the United States, including Harvard, Princeton and Yale, and German universities like Heidelberg, Freiburg and Leipzig. The Nazi eugenics program, which was funded and encouraged by the Globalists, grew directly from this racist philosophy.

The Globalists recognize that, even among white northern Europeans – the favoured race – there will be many who will resist the New World Order and its program of ethnic cleansing. H G Wells makes it quite clear that all such resistance will be dealt with in summary fashion and “malcontents” eliminated:

...when the struggle seems to be drifting definitely towards a world social democracy, there may still be very great delays and disappointments before it becomes an efficient and beneficent world system. Countless people...will hate the new world order...and will die protesting against it. When we attempt to evaluate its promise, we have to bear in mind the distress of a generation or so of malcontents, many of them quite gallant and graceful-looking people. – H G Wells, *The New World Order*, 1939 (from Chapter 12)

Evolution as a blend of Science and Magic

While those responsible for devising the fraudulent theory of evolution, as well as enforcing the phony principle of uniformitarianism in geology, had rejected the God of Creation, they were definitely not atheists. They simply worshipped a different god.

This was the god of the Rosicrucians, the Freemasons, Deists, Unitarians, and the many branches of occult philosophy that sprung up across Europe after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. For example, it is well known that Isaac Newton, who died in 1727, left a greater corpus of alchemical and theological speculation than conventional scientific writing. He took care all his life to hide the fact that he was a Deist and not a Christian. But there were many others like him. They all had one thing in common – they utterly rejected the deity of Christ.

Copious proof of this may be found in the most authoritative works of Masonic literature, such as those by Albert Pike and Manley Palmer Hall. A readily available modern work – *The Invisible College* by Robert Lomas (2002) – gives ample evidence that the Royal Society, which laid the foundations for anti-Biblical scepticism, was formed in 1660 by a cabal of Freemasons for this very purpose.

Professor Michael Ruse, who describes himself as “an ardent evolutionist”, made a very frank admission in this regard when he stated:

Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion – a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this one complaint...the literalists are absolutely right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today. – *How Evolution Became a Religion*, National Post, May 13, 2000.

No doubt many who believe in evolution today do not think in these terms, but they have nonetheless been inducted into a branch of the ancient pagan religions. While they may not accept the god of Freemasonry, the so-called Great Architect, they have unwittingly succumbed to the charms of a principal member of his pantheon, the goddess known as Destiny or Fate.

Like the pagan philosophers of Greece and Rome, the modern evolutionist is in thrall to the ancient metaphysical belief that seemingly chance events are controlled by *non-physical* forces beyond our understanding. Given enough time otherwise random processes will eventually produce a new type of order which could never have been predicted. To the shaman, this is magic; to the pagan it is fate or destiny; to the Hindu it is prana; to the Freemason it is order out of chaos – and to the modern biologist it is evolution. In short, they believe that an invisible, intangible intelligence permeates the universe and keeps it functioning in an orderly manner.

The ancient Romans could choose which among their gods they would honour and worship, but nearly all of them included the goddess Fortuna in their personal pantheon. She even featured on some of their coins:



She is associated with the medieval Wheel of Fortune, which incorporates elements from both the annual occult calendar and the zodiac of astrology. By honouring this goddess, the rank and file of Roman society were hoping to secure a little more good fortune than their destiny had determined. Every society in every civilisation has worshipped this goddess. Even hardened materialists are normally anxious to keep on the right side of Lady Luck.

One can see how respect for this goddess or principality is at work in the minds of evolutionists. A material process operates in a completely predictable, mechanical way for eons of time when suddenly, Lady Luck intervenes, and it moves into a higher level of order and complexity. The lifeless, sun-warmed pool gives birth to a protein, then an enzyme, then a long string of DNA which – with even more luck – turns into a living cell.

Evolution is 999 parts science and 1 part magic. And because the magical part is so small, it can be hidden away in eons of time and forgotten. Most evolutionists don't even realise that they believe in magic, that somewhere along the line, over millions of years, something magical happens – it only takes a second – and a new string of DNA is produced.

To their credit, Lewontin and his friend, Stephen Gould – another canonised saint of Evolution – recognised that the traditional evolutionary paradigm, whereby species evolved over millions of years through the accumulation of tiny beneficial changes, was fundamentally flawed. If a species evolved in that manner, then there would have to be dozens of intermediary stages in the fossil record. But there are none whatever. Instead they proposed the sudden emergence of a new species, with all of the necessary mutations occurring in a relatively short timeframe. In such a paradigm, the required changes would occur so quickly, by reference to geological time, that there would be no opportunity for the fossil record to capture and retain evidence of an intermediary stage.

This proposed new paradigm – which was given the fancy title, *punctuated equilibria* – was a gift to critics of evolutionary theory since it shone an embarrassingly bright light on the unspoken, magical component that had always been central to this occult philosophy. In the Gould-Lewontin model all the magic is compressed into a very short timeframe, where hundreds of utterly impossible mutations occur one after another in rapid succession. It need hardly be stated that the majority of traditional evolutionists reject this model as ridiculous, but they fail to see that their own model is just as dependent on Lady Luck. Magical thinking is magical thinking, no matter how one tries to disguise it.

A Stark Warning to Christians

The Bible condemned the Israelites for worshipping the deities, Fortune and Destiny:

But you who forsake the LORD, who forget my holy mountain, who set a table for **Fortune** and fill cups of mixed wine for **Destiny**, I will destine you to the sword, and all of you shall bow down to the slaughter, because, when I called, you did not answer; when I spoke, you did not listen, but you did what was evil in my eyes and chose what I did not delight in. – Isaiah 65:11-12

We should take this warning very seriously. The recognition of fortune or destiny, in any manner whatever, is straightforward idolatry and, as such, is deeply offensive to our Creator, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

It is impossible for a Christian to hold to these beliefs and still remain in a proper relationship with the LORD. This is why Satan and his fallen angelic hoard are so keen to get Christians to believe that fortune and destiny play a role – however small – in their day-to-day lives. While it is normal for pagans, Freemasons and other Luciferians to respect and honour these so-called deities, every true Christian should despise and reject them.

We would do well to reflect on another warning given by the LORD:

Yet ye have forsaken me, and served other gods: wherefore I will deliver you no more. Go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen; let them deliver you in the time of your tribulation. – Judges 10:13-14

This is directly applicable to all Christians today who believe in some form of *intelligent design* or *continuous creation*. Either one accepts the absolute sovereignty of God and His account of Creation given in Genesis – begun from nothing and completed in full in six 24-hour days – or one does not. To make His role in Creation conditional in any way on material processes, however ‘intelligent’ these processes may be, is straightforward idolatry.

Let no-one have any doubt about this. Destiny, fate, magic, prana, evolution and the rest are simply gimmicks that Satan is using to deceive – and destroy – his victims.

Blinding the opposition with ‘Science’

Whenever evolutionists are put on the spot, they generally point to the latest research – “But what about...?” – as proof that meaningful advances are still being made. This can be a very effective ploy since virtually no-one with any sense keeps up with evolutionary ‘research’ except ardent evolutionists. By continually publishing new ‘research’ and proposing or developing new experimental methodologies, cross-disciplinary techniques and so forth, they make it virtually impossible for anyone to contest the absurdity of their claims in a manner that evolutionists would find acceptable. Either you play the game their way or you don’t play at all.

This is how a cult works. The insiders, who have the ‘truth’, are impervious to reason. Any argument that might refute their assertions is turned inside out and taken as further proof of just how resilient their theory really is. And since the admissibility of evidence is determined by their theory, there is little point in trying to present them with unpalatable facts.

Evolutionists are effectively immune to arguments from the real world. The possibility that evolution itself might be utterly bogus does not even enter their minds. Indeed, in some cases their disregard for the real world is so great that they take evident pleasure in dismissing its glorious variety as nothing but a meaningless spectacle.

Evolution is utterly impossible because deleterious mutations will always accumulate thousands, if not millions of times faster than the so-called beneficial ones. Always. Not one species on earth is evolving. In fact, they are all ‘devolving’, gradually losing their genetic integrity by imperceptible degrees. Every generation or so a few more deleterious mutations enter the gene pool of each species. The Second Law of Thermodynamics will always ensure that this happens, where the high level of order encoded in the DNA of each species will progressively lose tiny amounts of its information content over time. If left unchecked, this universal process would eventually wipe out all life on earth.

Why don’t evolutionists see this? While one can point to the cult-like environment in which they move, as well as the weight of indoctrination to which they have been subjected since childhood, there is a further reason. They have been trained to harvest and analyze new data on an ongoing basis, to conduct more and more research, which in turn provides endless scope for speculation, theorising and conjecture. They are seduced – and blinded – by the prospect that the earth-shattering proof of evolution, which they have craved for so long, lies just around the corner.

The modern science of genetics is opening up a whole new world of data, a world that evolutionists are determined to exploit. The comparative analysis of genomes will be used to make all kinds of spurious, non-falsifiable claims in support of evolution. What is more, the specialized nature of the subject will ensure that only the experts – evolutionists, of course – will be eligible to comment.

Evolutionary Hoaxes, Deceptions and Lies

Having examined many of the flaws, anomalies and contradictions in the theory of evolution, it would seem appropriate at this stage to cite a few instances of downright fraud. The ‘science’ itself is so deficient in hard evidence that some of its more extreme proponents have from time to time resorted to blatant deception to confirm its veracity.

Here are just a few of many well-documented examples.

- Java Man

The Dutch paleoanthropologist Eugene Dubois discovered the fossilised remains of a cranial fragment, a femur and a few teeth in Java in 1891 and promptly declared that they belonged to an early hominid which he called *pithecanthropus erectus*. This find proved to be hugely influential and has featured in college textbooks ever since. But for thirty years Dubois neglected to inform the public that he had *also* found two human skulls near the same location as ‘Java Man’. Any realistic interpretation of the data would lead one to conclude that the femur was indeed human, just like the two skulls, but that the cranial fragment was that of an ape. By withholding information about the two skulls, Dubois was engaging in plain, old-fashioned fraud.

Note also the credulity of the scientists who were prepared to accept as definitive the flimsy ‘evidence’ presented by Dubois. One quickly learns, when examining the murky annals of paleoanthropology, that realism and common sense are frequently set aside in the obsessive drive to prove that man evolved from an ape. It doesn’t matter how trivial or pathetic the evidence happens to be as long as it sufficiently obscures to fool the public.

- Piltdown Man

When the fossilised remains of a skull and jawbone were found in a quarry in Piltdown, East Sussex in 1912, many of the world’s foremost paleoanthropologists hailed the find as evidence of a new species of early hominid, the much sought-after missing link between apes and modern man. It was not until 1953 that the Piltdown fossil was exposed as a fabrication that combined the skull of a modern human with the lower jaw-bone of an orangutan. In short, a deliberate fraud. The teeth had been filed and the bones stained in such a way as to approximate to what the evolutionists had hoped to find. This ought to have alerted the world at large to the credulity and naivety of the paleontological community as a whole, and to the outright dishonesty of a nucleus within it, but the textbooks and scientific journals preferred to gloss over the entire incident as an unfortunate once-off event.

The scientific community usually refers to the Piltdown incident as a hoax, as though it was something fundamentally harmless. But Piltdown was plainly not a hoax, but a crime. The continued unwillingness of the evolutionist community to describe the Piltdown fraud as a crime, and not merely a hoax, is indicative of the compromise, prejudice, and duplicity that still infect its ranks.

- Nebraska Man

In 1922 a leading evolutionist (and eugenicist), Henry Osborn, declared that a fossilised tooth found five years earlier in Nebraska was conclusive proof of a hitherto unknown species of hominid. Nebraska Man, as he was known, was cited in college textbooks as evidence of evolution and the simian origins of mankind. Some publications even carried an artist's depiction of what they imagined Nebraska Man must have looked like. However, not all scientists were convinced and it became clear after a few years that Osborn and his supporters were gravely mistaken.

The tooth was actually that of an extinct species of *pig*. Yes, a pig. This unsavoury episode highlighted yet again the willingness of a large segment of the scientific community to believe mouth-watering claims based on ridiculously trivial 'evidence' – in this case a pig's tooth. This tendency has never abated and paleontologists continue shamelessly to proclaim discoveries and breakthroughs that have no scientific validity. And since their work is reviewed by their peers – who possess the same elastic attitude to scientific rigour – it is never called seriously into question.

- Haeckel's Embryo Chart

Dubois, the creator of Java Man, was a disciple of the 'great' Ernst Haeckel, a very influential German professor at the University of Jena. Haeckel had published a set of prints in 1866 depicting the embryonic development of several species. These purported to show that the development cycle in the womb reflected (or 'recapitulated') the same stages that a species passed through during the long process of its evolution.

Haeckel's chart proved to be one of the greatest propaganda tools in history. Almost at a glance it seemed to provide irrefutable evidence that evolution was true. College students across Europe and America were converted in their thousands by his seductive chart.

The problem with Haeckel's chart is that it was a complete fabrication. Beginning with legitimate images of the embryos of different species, he made a number of adjustments to make them look more alike. He mixed embryos, removed or added parts, changed the relative size of various features and misidentified others, and one way or other distorted the evidence until he had achieved the outcome he wanted. Remember all of this was carried out at a time when the science of comparative embryology was little understood. Haeckel was aware that only a handful of experienced academics in Europe and America would be able to contest his claims but that, given the prestige of the University of Jena, this was unlikely.

However, someone *did* speak out. Professor Ludwig Rutimeyer of the University of Basel demonstrated to the authorities at Jena in 1868 that Haeckel's drawings were "a sin against scientific truthfulness." For example, he could show that Haeckel used the *same* woodcut to illustrate the embryos of three different species. Haeckel was forced to admit that his drawings were defective, but incredibly he was allowed to continue in his post. What is more, his retraction was apparently so low-key that the fraud was exposed all over again some years later, in 1874, by Professor Wilhelm His of the University of Leipzig. His stated that Haeckel had engaged in "blatant fraud" and "had eliminated himself from the ranks of scientific research workers of any stature."

One would think that Haeckel and his phony chart would have been reviled thereafter by the scientific community. But this never happened – which is a scandal in itself. Instead of denouncing the fraud committed by Haeckel, evolutionists have *continued* to use his chart as though it was authentic. It has been reproduced in countless college textbooks throughout the 20th century, and is still in use today.

- Haeckel's monera

Like many early evolutionists, Haeckel was both a pantheist and a racist. He nursed a deep hatred of Biblical truth and wanted his fellow Germans to worship the goddess Venus. He favoured the elimination of weak and deformed children through abortion and infanticide, the mass sterilization of millions of 'inferior' people, and the introduction of a nationwide euthanasia program to administer "a painless and rapid poison" to thousands of "incurables".

Haeckel also had his own version of the *Simple Cell Trick*. He alleged that a primeval slime in the ocean depths, laden with hitherto unknown micro-organisms which he called *monera*, functioned as a kind of universal mechanism for transforming inorganic ingredients into living cells. While he had no evidence whatever for his *monera* theory, his reputation was such that it was accepted by many scientists across Europe as an established fact. As it happened, the English evolutionist, T H Huxley, found what he believed to be evidence for *monera* in mud samples dredged from the floor of the North Atlantic, and even named the new 'species' *bathybius haeckelii*. However a few years later a ship's chemist discovered that the alcohol used to preserve the mud samples could produce an amorphous precipitate which Huxley had mistaken for evidence of organic life. Had this hilarious news not been suppressed, the ensuing scandal would have destroyed the reputations of many leading scientists across Europe.

Huxley was an ambitious manipulator. He formed a group of leading scientists which exercised an extraordinary influence over the British scientific establishment in the period 1865-1890. Known as the *X Club*, it set the agenda and decided the priorities of leading institutions like the Royal Society and the British Association for the Advancement of Science. His group also appointed fellow evolutionists to senior positions in other institutions, thus ensuring that the British scientific establishment would continue to be dominated by individuals who shared their contempt for Biblical truth. In their biography of Darwin, Adrian Desmond and James Moore aptly described the club as "a sort of masonic Darwinian lodge."

Apparently they called themselves the X Club, not because they had no clearly defined objectives – when obviously they had – but because they didn't wish the public to recognise their determination to 'professionalise' science by eliminating all reference to a Creator and putting in place what Desmond and Moore called "an intellectual priesthood."

Similar clubs were in existence in the US, where it was known as the *Scientific Lazzaroni*, and in France, where it was called the *Society of Arceuil*. This kind of manipulation continues to this day, not just in Britain but across Europe and the US, thereby ensuring that politically-motivated theories like evolution, the big bang, alien intelligence, and global warming are given a scientific veneer and provided with ample funding for research and propaganda purposes.

- A few more examples

We could give many more examples. Taken collectively they depict a discipline driven by irrationality, self-deception, vested interests, sloppy scientific practices, and a truly staggering disregard for even rudimentary standards of scientific integrity.

Just consider the following:

- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to contend that the existence of a feathered version of *archaeopteryx*, the so-called missing link between reptiles and birds, has been confirmed by fossil evidence when the only known fossil specimen has been shown to be a manmade counterfeit?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to maintain that the different 'species' of finch on the remote Galapagos Islands are proof of evolution when they are simply varieties derived from a common genome, just like breeds of dog?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to promote the peppered moth as proof of evolution when it has long been known that the same genome is capable of producing all of the observed variation?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to maintain that four-winged fruit flies, which were developed through artificial genetic mutation in a laboratory, are not a new species but a genetically damaged version of the original?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to proclaim the so-called 'Horse Chart' as evidence of evolution when many of their own associates reject it as a just-so story, where even the hyrax (a rabbit-like animal still found in Africa today) is portrayed as an extinct species of horse? (*Again, I would remind the reader that I am not making this stuff up.*)
- ▶ Why is the fossil category known as *australopithecus afarensis* still being touted as a missing link when it has long been demonstrated that the best known specimen ('Lucy') – a small collection of non-descript bones – was simply an ape with no bipedal walking ability whatever?

- ▶ Why do evolutionists still refer to the existence of so-called vestigial organs as evidence of evolution when so many of their prime examples – the thymus, pineal and pituitary glands, and so-called ‘junk’ DNA – are long known to be scientific flimflam of the worst kind?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists still try to contend that bacteria develop a resistance to antibiotics through a process of evolution when it is well known that this resistance is *already* present in a minute percentage of the host population and that the mass death of their colleagues simply allows this miniscule remnant to flourish?
- ▶ Why do evolutionists still talk about the existence of similar genes across species as evidence of common ancestry when it is well known that no causal or developmental relationship of any kind has been demonstrated? The same information sequence embedded in two larger sequences may perform dramatically different functions in each case. For example, the number sequence 123 has a vastly different function in the number 123456789 than it does in the number 987654123. This is yet another of the many stupid ideas that pass for evidence in the mad world of evolution.
- ▶ Why do evolutionists continue to portray ‘co-evolution’ or co-dependence between species as a proof of evolution when, in reality, it only serves to highlight just how nonsensical the concept of evolution really is? For example, a certain species of plant can be pollinated only by a certain species of bird, which in turn is completely dependent on the plant for its nourishment. Neither species can exist without the other. That should an arrangement could have arisen by chance is many billions of times more improbable than the ‘evolution’ of either species separately. Seemingly in the mad world of evolution the more improbable something is, the more likely it is to be true.

A Few Words on Radiometric Dating

We cannot conclude our review without first saying a few words about radiometric dating. It is probably fair to say that, for most people, even those who don’t believe in evolution, radiometric dating provides convincing proof that the earth is hundreds of millions of years old.

It is based on the fact that, as radioactive material in a rock decays over a long period of time, it leaves behind a residual material, for example when potassium-40 decays to argon-40 or when rubidium-87 decays to strontium-87. The quantity of this material, which can be determined fairly precisely by chemical analysis, is in turn an accurate measure of the total amount of decay that has taken place. Since the decay rates for each radioisotope are already known it would certainly seem a very promising way of determining the total amount of time that must have elapsed since the decay process began.

Unfortunately, there are serious problems with this approach. It assumes that the rate of radioactive decay is constant over millions of years – *this has never been proven*. It assumes also that the original amount of marker residue in the specimen was zero – *there is no way of knowing this*. And it assumes that no chemical or other process has occurred that could have affected the amount of marker residue in the specimen. *Again, there is no way of knowing this*.

Even secular scientists concede that there are serious problems with radiometric dating. As evolutionist Dr William Stansfield has said:

It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be. Age estimates on a given geologic stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological 'clock'. – *The Science of Evolution, Macmillan, New York, 1977*

Note that age estimates can sometimes differ by hundreds of millions of years!

Another crucial fact, which even Christians seem to overlook, is that the world at the time of Creation would have appeared vastly older than it really was. Radiometric measurements would likely have shown rock samples in those early days to be tens, if not hundreds, of millions of years old.

So What is Really Going On?

The so-called science of evolution contradicts several known scientific laws, it plays fast and loose with the facts, it is dominated by figures who quash dissent and ridicule critics, it offers no scientifically valid basis for testing or falsifying its theories, it has been riddled with fraud and deception from the start, it never admits its mistakes, it has never produced a single piece of irrefutable evidence to prove its claims, it is contradicted by massive gaps in the fossil record, it is plagued by in-fighting and disagreement among its adherents, it has never been observed (even in a laboratory under carefully controlled conditions), and it purports to explain the staggering complexity of the natural world purely on the basis of an almost endless series of fortuitous accidents (not one of which has ever been observed).

And they have the audacity to call it a science!

By now it ought to be obvious to all but the most obtuse readers that Evolution is not a science but a scam. It has only one purpose, namely to discredit the Biblical account of Creation and to elevate the atheistic concepts of chaos and randomness to the level of universal ordering principles. It tries to replace the Biblical God of Creation with pagan deities like Fortune and Destiny, or the Great Architect of Freemasonry, or the rabid nihilism of Christ-hating humanists.

Evolution provides a pseudo-moral justification for abortion, infanticide, euthanasia, ethnic cleansing, and the control and exploitation of humanity by a self-appointed elite. It gives a basis for replacing 'outdated' social practices, such as marriage, monogamy, the family, fidelity, heterosexuality, the community and the nation, with more 'efficient' models of social organisation.

Evolutionists think that, by substituting inference for evidence, credulity for causality, and magic for logic, they can meet the exacting standards of true science. But they can't. Evolution is nothing but a well organized charade.

Furthermore, by making genuine science seem morally neutral, evolution opens the door to genetic experimentation and transhumanism – which seek to 'enhance' the human genome and food supply, merge human and animal DNA, and create machine-human hybrids.

In short it allows man to do pretty much what he pleases.

Evolution is promoted by wealthy pagans and practitioners of the occult who have vast financial resources at their disposal. They do so through their control over educational curricula, the endowment of chairs at universities, ownership of influential publishing houses, the provision of scholarships and grants to advance the cause of evolution, making movies and documentaries which promote evolution, controlling scientific journals, offering awards and other inducements to attract support for evolution, highlighting evolution in the popular media, and in many other ways. Some of the same mechanisms, particularly those relating to the popular media, are also being used – sometimes subtly, sometimes outrageously – to ridicule Creationism.

For anyone who has studied history, none of this should be surprising. Propaganda has been used for thousands of years by the rich and powerful to control and indoctrinate the masses. And it continues to be used to this day because it works. The Global Elite, who control the world through the international banking system, powerful international corporations, and a network of secret societies, are made up almost entirely of Christ-hating Luciferians. They take care to hide their true religious convictions and often pretend to be 'Christian', but they worship a different god, the angel of light known as Lucifer.

Anyone who believes in evolution is submitting to one of the most devious propaganda programs ever devised. It is a stepping stone to atheism, humanism and nihilism, freemasonry, pantheism, and the occult.

So the next time you hear a honey-toned narrator from the BBC pontificating about the wonders of the natural world, take note of the fact that he never gives credit to the Creator...Never! They are all just one big accident, he says, formed exclusively by the random processes of Evolution. In reality, these series, which comprise hours and hours of footage, are little more than extended exercises in blasphemy. We should hardly wonder that the headquarters of the BBC in Shepherd's Bush, London, is built around a massive shrine to Helios – the sun god better known as Lucifer.



National Geographic, the History Channel, the Discovery Channel – all are propaganda tools for evolution, humanism, socialism and one world government. All are set up and funded by the Elite. And all are designed to undermine and destroy Christianity.

Closing comments

Evolution is a fantasy world which perverts human reason, where shysters can weave their lies without being held to account, where a pig's tooth is proof of human evolution, where patent nonsense – like the existence of vestigial organs or the Great Rift Valley theory – can be presented as legitimate science, where a racist elite can slaughter millions of 'undesirables', where abortion is a lifestyle choice, where man is just another variety of ape, where a sprinkling of pixie dust brings order out of chaos, where magic and logic are interchangeable, and where moral values have absolutely no meaning. And the whole thing is designed and taught, not by criminal psychopaths – as one would have expected – but by college professors and 'really nice people'.

If you are one of the unfortunate innocents who believe in evolution, and yet are familiar with much of the material set out in this paper, then shame on you. Not only are you harming yourself spiritually, but you are harming others by your foolishness. You have a good mind – why not use it? Take a long hard look at the gormless nonsense known as evolution, at the snake-oil peddled by the Luciferian propaganda machine, and ask yourself how you could ever have believed such mind-numbing drivel.

Jeremy James
Ireland
16 March 2012

Just one example

I found I couldn't complete this paper without giving at least one example of Our Father's wonderful creations. The example I have chosen, the Venus Flower Basket, is from the website **creationmoments.com** -

The Venus Flower Basket

Ask any evolutionist, and he will tell you that the Venus Flower Basket is one of the least-evolved animals. This animal is actually a sponge that is made up of a colony of creatures, and it does some amazing things.



The Venus Flower Basket builds a basket-like skeleton made up of glass-like silica covered only by a thin layer of cells. The intricate internal structure of this skeleton is reinforced to provide the greatest strength using the least amount of material. The resulting skeleton turns out to be a fiber optic network whose sophistication has been compared to modern fiber optics used for telecommunications networks.

Symbiotic luminescent micro-organisms make a home inside the base of the sponge, sending their light throughout the Flower Basket's fiber optic skeleton. The Flower Basket traps shrimp inside this skeleton, where they spend their entire lives. The food they drop feeds those luminescent micro-organisms at the bottom of the basket. The purpose of the light pulses is to attract prey to feed the shrimp, who, in turn, feed the source of the light pulses! All of this is even more impressive, given the fact that the Flower Basket has **no nervous system whatsoever**.

[Text and photo from www.creationmoments.com]

Bibliography

Works by authors who reject Evolution

Ashton, John (ed)	<i>In Six Days</i> , Master Books, 2001
Bergman, Jerry	<i>The Dark Side of Charles Darwin</i> , Master Books, 2011
Brown, Walt	<i>In the Beginning</i> , Center for Scientific Creation, 1980
Cloud, David	<i>Seeing the Non-Existent</i> , Way of Life Literature, 2011
Cohen, I L	<i>Darwin was Wrong</i> , New Research Publications, 1984
Ferrell, Vance	<i>The Evolution Cruncher</i> , Evolution Facts, 2001
Haller, John	<i>Outcasts from Evolution</i> , Southern Illinois University Press, 1971 & 1995
Hunt, Dave	<i>Cosmos, Creator and Human Destiny</i> , The Berean Call, 2010
Kleiss, R & Kleiss, T	<i>A Closer Look at the Evidence</i> , Search for the Truth Publications, 2003
Lisle, Jason	<i>Taking Back Astronomy</i> ,
Matrisciana, C & Oakland, R	<i>The Evolution Conspiracy</i> , Harvest House, 1991
Morris, Henry	<i>Scientific Creationism</i> , Master Books, 1974
Morris, Henry	<i>The Long War Against God</i> , Master Books, 2000
Perloff, James	<i>Tornado in a Junkyard</i> , Refuge Books, 1999
Sarfati, Jonathan	<i>Refuting Evolution</i> , Answers in Genesis, 1999
Weikart, Richard	<i>From Darwin to Hitler</i> , Palgrave, 2004
Wells, Jonathan	<i>Icons of Evolution</i> , Regnery Publishing, 2000
Whitcomb, J & Morris, H	<i>The Genesis Flood</i> , Baker Book House, 1961

Works by authors who support Evolution

Dawkins, Richard	<i>The Blind Watchmaker</i> , Longman, 1986
Dawkins, Richard	<i>The Extended Phenotype</i> , OUP, 1989
Dawkins, Richard	<i>The Selfish Gene</i> , OUP, 1976 and 1989
Gould, Stephen Jay	<i>Ever Since Darwin</i> , Pelican Books, 1980
Gould, Stephen Jay	<i>Hen's Teeth and Horses Toes</i> , Norton & Co, 1983
Gould, Stephen Jay	<i>The Mismeasure of Man</i> , Norton & Co, 1981
Gould, Stephen Jay	<i>The Panda's Thumb</i> , Norton & Co, 1980
Gould, Stephen Jay	<i>Wonderful Life</i> , Penguin Books, 1989
Gribbin, J & Gribbin, M	<i>Being Human</i> , J M Dent, 1993
Johanson, D & Maitland, A	<i>Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind</i> , Granada, 1981
Johanson, D & Shreeve, J	<i>Lucy's Child</i> , Viking, 1990
Jones, Steve	<i>The Language of the Genes</i> , Flamingo, 1993
Jones, Steve	<i>The Single Helix</i> , Abacus, 2005
Jones, Steve	<i>Y: The Descent of Man</i> , Abacus, 2003
Ridley, Matt	<i>Genome</i> , Fourth Estate, 1999
Ridley, Matt	<i>Nature Via Nurture</i> , Fourth Estate, 2003
Ridley, Matt	<i>The Origins of Virtue</i> , Viking, 1996
Ridley, Matt	<i>The Red Queen</i> , Viking, 1993
Wilson, Edward O	<i>Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge</i> , Little Brown, 1998
Wilson, Edward O	<i>Naturalist</i> , Island Press, 1994
Wilson, Edward O	<i>On Human Nature</i> , Harvard University Press, 1978

Works by other authors

Barzun, Jacques	<i>Darwin, Marx, Wagner</i> , University of Chicago, 2 nd edition, 1958
Desmond, A & Moore, J	<i>Darwin</i> , Penguin, 1992
Lomas, Robert	<i>The Invisible College</i> , Corgi, 2009
Olson, Steve	<i>Mapping Human History</i> , Mariner Books, 2003
Pinker, Steven	<i>The Blank Slate</i> , Allen Lane, 2002
Prigogine, I & Stengers, I	<i>Order Out of Chaos</i> , Bantam Books, 1984
Quigley, Carroll	<i>The Anglo-American Establishment</i> , GSG & Associates, 1981
Quigley, Carroll	<i>Tragedy and Hope</i> , GSG & Associates, 1966
Rees, Martin	<i>Just Six Numbers</i> , Basic Books, 2001
Rose, H & Rose, S (eds)	<i>Alas Poor Darwin</i> , Jonathan Cape, 2000
Rose, Stephen	<i>Lifelines: Biology, Freedom, Determinism</i> , Allen Lane, 1997
Schnoebelen, Bill	<i>Masonry – Beyond the Light</i> , Chick Publications, 1991
Sykes, Bryan	<i>The Seven Daughters of Eve</i> , Bantam Press, 2001
Taylor, Gordon Rattray	<i>The Great Evolution Mystery</i> , Secker & Warburg, 1983
Velikovsky, I	<i>Earth in Upheaval</i> , Doubleday, 1955
Webb, James	<i>The Occult Underground</i> , Open Court Publishing, 1974
Yates, Frances	<i>The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age</i> , Routledge, 1979
Yates, Frances	<i>The Rosicrucian Enlightenment</i> , Routledge, 1972

**For more information about the organised
assault on Christianity visit
www.zephaniah.eu**

Copyright Jeremy James 2012